

REMARKS

The foregoing amendment and following remarks are in response to the Office Action dated October 5, 2007.

All of the claims have been rejected in view *Johnston*, U.S. Patent No. 5,673,333, either alone or in combination with other references.

The Office Action asserts that *Johnston* discloses recognition and processing means that determine whether a check (i.e., document) has been fully completed by ascertaining that the check contains a signature, date, and a monetary amount, and that such recognition and processing means is for extracting data from the document (Office Action at 4). Accordingly, the Office Action surmises, the signature, date, and amount information may be considered field names and associated data values representing information from the document (Office Action at 5).

However, there is no indication in *Johnston* that the reference extracts content comprising both field names and a data value as required by the claims. By way of example only and without limitation, the specification of the instant invention teaches producing a file containing both field names and the actual data values associated with those values:

The OCR engines scan each image against a predefined form, or template, and produce a comma separated file representing the field names and associated corresponding to the content of the submitted TIFF or PDF image. In essence a file a name/value pairs representing the information on the form is produced (e.g., First Name = John, Last Name = Smith, Age = 32).

Specification ¶37.) As for the portions of *Johnston* relied upon by the Examiner, merely checking for the existence of markings (e.g., was the check signed? Is the date missing?) is not the same as extracting both field names (e.g., last name) and values

(e.g., Smith). While there is a portion of Johnston -- not relied upon by the Examiner -- which teaches extracting the amount written on the check and printing the amount on the check (Johnston, col. 6, lns. 42-50), there is no teaching in this portion either relating to field names.

Applicant has introduced additional limitations into claim 22 which further differentiate over the prior art.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Office Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he/she telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: October 31, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By


Jeffrey S. Dickey
Registration No.: 35,858
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUML HOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant